

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

Office Action Rejections Summary

Claims 39-40, 50-53, and 63-66 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,389,464 of Krishnamurthy et al. (“Krishnamurthy”), U.S. Patent No. 6,393,475 of Leong et al. (“Leong”), and U.S. Patent No. 6,678,827 of Rothermel et al. (“Rothermel”).

Status of Claims

Claims 39-40, 50-53, and 63-66 are pending in the application. No claims have been amended. No claims have been added. No new matter has been added. No claims have been presently canceled.

Claim Rejections

Claims 39-40, 50-53, and 63-66 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnamurthy, Leong, and Rothermel. It is submitted that claim 39 is patentable over the combination of cited references because the combination of the cited references would lack one or more limitations of claim 39. Claim 39 includes the limitation of “a **combined** hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) **server and SNMP manager**” (emphasis added).

The Office Action states:

Regarding claim 39, Krishnamurthy et al show: an SNMP agent with direct access to configuration data (column 4 lines 44-54), an HTTP server (column 10 lines 30-47) and SNMP manager only accessing configuration data by communicating with the SNMP agent (column 9 lines 1-24, column 13 lines 16-36), a combined text interface generator and HTTP client only accessing configuration data by requesting the HTTP server and SNMP manager to communicate with the SNMP agent

(column 11 lines 45-56, column 13 lines 30-45) so that all safety mechanisms are built into the agent for security (column 9 lines 1-10). Krishnamurthy et al may not explicitly show a combined HTTP server and SNMP manager, but do mention the combined text interface and HTTP client (as noted above) and the incorporating of data concerning the network management with the browser format. **Furthermore, Leong et al do show combining the HTTP server and SNMP manager, to incorporate data concerning the network management with the browser format (column 3 lines 45-57, column 6 lines 25-40).** It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to combine the HTTP server and SNMP manager in Krishnamurthy et al, because it would provide an efficient way to incorporate data concerning network management with the browser format.

(Office Action, 9/22/04, pp. 2-3)(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action's assertions and characterizations of the references. In particular, it is respectfully submitted that Leong does not show combining a HTTP server a SNMP manager as purported by the Office Action. The Office Action cites to column 3 lines 45-57 and column 6 lines 25-40 of Leong in support of its assertion. Leong, at said passages, states:

Data concerning the network management function is then propagated from the agent to the remote device in a format capable of display by the browser. More specifically, a HTML document is composed by the agent and then propagated from the agent to the remote device for display by the browser, the document incorporating the data concerning the network management function. Alternatively, the data may be propagated in a format for display by the browser under the direction of an application program resident of the remote device. The network management function relating to the network device is performed in response to a network management request issued from the browser. (Leong, column 3 lines 45-57)

The network device 32 is shown to be coupled to an intranet 36 and an internet 38. Also coupled to the intranet 36 is a remote device 39, such as a computer, on which resides a client 40, in the form of a web browser. Similarly, remote devices 42 and 44 each have a client 40 installed thereon and are coupled to the internet 38. The clients 40 propagate request messages to the network management agent 30 which, in response to the request messages, propagates response messages to the clients 40. In one embodiment, these response messages incorporate HTML documents, and accordingly the network device 32 may be viewed by the clients 40 as an HTML server. The network management agent 30 supports a set of

managed objects, which in one embodiment are Management Information Base (MIB) objects. (Leong, column 6 lines 25-40).

It is submitted that nowhere in the above passage of Leong, cited to by the Office Action, does it disclose a combined HTTP server and SNMP manager.

Moreover, it is submitted that Leong teaches away from such a combination. Leong states that while arrangement shown Figs. 1A and 1B allow a degree of network management to be performed from a client resident on a remote device, there are a number of limitations inherent in these arrangements. Specifically, the HTTP protocol is primarily intended to facilitate the retrieval of static documents by a client from a server. While, the SNMP protocol is intended to facilitate network management in a simple and effective manner. (Leong, col. 3, lines 18-25). As such, one of skill in the art faced with the teachings of Leong would not be motivated to combine a HTTP server and a SNMP manager because Leong teaches that such a combination of HTTP protocol and SNMP protocol functions would be inefficient and undesirable. Neither Krishnamurthy, Leong, nor Rothermel, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the above noted limitation of claim 39. Therefore, claim 39 is patentable over the cited references. Given that claim 40 depends from claim 39, it is submitted that claim 40 is also patentable over the cited references.

For reasons similar to those given above with respect to claim 39, it is submitted that claims 50-53, and 63-66 are also patentable over the cited references.

In conclusion, applicants respectfully submit that in view of the arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejection has been overcome.


If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Daniel Ovanezian at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 12/13, 2004


Daniel E. Ovanezian
Registration No. 41,236

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300

FIRST CLASS CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

on 12/13/04
Date of Deposit

JUANITA BRISCOE
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Signature

12/13/04
Date